Task Force Members Present: Chair - Chris Clements - UC Davis, Vice-Chair - Christine Crawford, Yolo County Broadband Working Group, Jeff Mischkinsky - DavisGig, Mike Adams - Davis Community Network, Autumn Labbe-Renault - Davis Media Access, Jacques Franco - Utility Rate Advisory Committee, Marcia Bernard - DJUSD, Carolyn Stiver - Davis Chamber of Commerce, Stephen McMahon - Community Representative

Task Force Members Absent: Scott Adler - Community Representative

Staff: Diane Parro, Chief Innovation Officer; Sarah Worley, Deputy Innovation Officer, Robert Schulz, Media Services Specialist

1. Call to Order & Roll Call - 6:32 pm

2. Approval of Agenda – Motion by Mike Adams. Seconded by Jacques Franco. Passed unanimously, 9-0, one absent.

3. Brief Announcements from Staff and Task Force –
   Phillip Arndt, Comcast Director of Government Affairs contacted staff to check on progress of study and convey willingness to meet with Task Force if they are interested.
   Chair Clements - participated in webinar on Swedish company COS Systems program that could be valuable in determining future penetration rates; recommend adding to future agenda for Task Force to look at in more detail.


5. Consent Calendar

6. Regular Items
   A. Citywide Fiber Optic Network Feasibility Study
      Recommended Actions:
      i. Receive Updates from Draft Report Subcommittees and Staff
      ii. Discuss Subcommittee and Task Force Member Comments
      iii. Identify Additional Information/Revisions Needed to Complete Preliminary Report
      iv. Review Process and Time Frames
      v. Next Steps

   Chair summarized subcommittee assignments, and confirmed report review process. Staff confirmed there was no feasibility study timeline or deadline the Task Force needed to adhere to. Task Force members were asked to provide an overview of their impressions about
the report and key questions. Their discussion included the following topics, comments and questions:

- **Model Results** - Is Task Force okay with the estimated numbers and cost ranges bracketed in the study?
  - Sense that a lot of the assumptions of costs are “worst case” and overinflated by intention, such as equipment costs and labor costs (e.g. $50K salary for customer service representative). Need to get a better understanding of why costs are high.
  - Would favor looking at conservative, realistic and optimal ranges.
  - Project driven by capital costs. In retail model key issue is how do you recoup the $54 million in fiber costs?

- **Model Assumptions** - Do we need CCG to look at different assumptions?
  - Want to see specific information about model assumptions, which is missing or distributed throughout the report and hard to find.
  - Suggest providing a list of general assumptions that went into models in report before discussion of study models evaluated (pg. 48).
  - Have questions about the cost estimates for network construction and operation specific assumptions they are based on. For example why were fiber cost estimates so high? Why is it necessary to run fiber down both sides of the street?
  - Want to better understand assumed penetration rates and how they impact time needed to reach “cash positive” status.
  - Are Multi-family dwelling unit penetration rates realistic?
  - Could look at both sides of cost issue, how to get cost of installing network and electronics and costs of operating the network down?
  - Should Task Force consider requesting sensitivity analysis changing inputs e.g. a retail model with a 20% lower cost “best case”?

- **Changes to Executive Summary** - expand to include:
  - Section on benefits, including broader revenue benefits.
  - Discussion of feasibility of phasing fiber network, reference cities with successful phased projects.

- **Requests for Additional Information to Consider:**
  - Multi-family dwelling unit (MDU) penetration rates will be important. Is additional MDU analysis needed to complete draft or as remain as a next step as identified by CCG?
  - City has partners to talk to about potential penetration rates, and potential benefits from working together, such as the school district, university, water districts, MDU owners etc.

8 **Task Force and Staff Brief Communications**

A. Agenda Planning and Long Range Calendar
B. Community News - none
C. Recommended Reading - none

9. **Adjourn** – 8:43 p.m. by consensus
City of Davis
Broadband Advisory Task Force Special Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, November 29, 2017

Task Force Members Present: Chair - Chris Clements - UC Davis, Vice-Chair - Christine Crawford, Yolo County Broadband Working Group, Jeff Mischkinsky - DavisGig, Mike Adams - Davis Community Network, Autumn Labbe-Renault - Davis Media Access, Jacques Franco - Utility Rate Advisory Committee, Marcia Bernard - DJUSD, Carolyn Stiver - Davis Chamber of Commerce, Stephen McMahon - Community Representative, 
Task Force Members Absent: Scott Adler - Community Representative

Staff: Diane Parro, Chief Innovation Officer; Sarah Worley, Deputy Innovation Officer, Robert Schulz, Media Services Specialist

1. Call to Order & Roll Call – Chair opened Special Meeting and Regular Meeting at 6:32 p.m. With Task Force consensus, special meeting item would be taken up first to allow for public comment on it early.

2. Approval of Agenda – Motion to approve by Mike Adams. Seconded by Autumn Labbe-Renault. Motion passed unanimously 9-0, 1 absent.

3. Public Comment – Eric Gudz, member of Bicycling Transportation and Street Safety Commission speaking as a citizen - glad Task Force is addressing topic, it sends a positive message to millennials in the community. Recognize there are many sides to discussion of net neutrality and recommended Task Force discussion address specific terms in Title II, impacts of proposed changes and how it would affect businesses.

4. Regular Items
   A. Net Neutrality Discussion

   Diane Parro reviewed purpose of Special Agenda and the City Council legislative subcommittee’s interest in the Task Force having an opportunity to discuss and convey any recommendations on this topic to City Council.

   Autumn Labbe-Renault provided overview of issue – recommended reading rule information on FCC website. There is an expectation that results will be increased costs that are passed on to consumers. FCC is expected to vote Dec. 14th. Davis’ federal representatives support retaining net neutrality. Task Force recommendation should be brief and focus on what community will lose. Portugal is an example of a place that never had net neutrality and broadband provider packages reflect limited content choices.

   Task Force discussion included the following points:
   - Net neutrality doesn’t push entity to provide service (e.g. common carrier vs. utility).
   - Consumers still must find a service provider and increased bundling of services and contracts limit options.
• Favor net neutrality as it supports business development, and very important for small startup businesses that are priorities for community support.
• Proposed changes to Title II would result in two serious impacts: loss of the ability to regulate price, and loss of open, equal access for all internet service providers.
• Loss of net neutrality would have greater adverse impacts on communities of color and lower social-economic groups.
• FCC considers competition a remedy but there are many areas, including Davis where competition is limited or doesn’t exist.
• Davis is particularly vulnerable to monopolization of broadband.
• A significant concern is the choking of the free flow of information, if carriers are able to pick and choose what content providers they allow on their networks.

Motion by Mike Adams, seconded by Jacques Franco: “The Broadband Advisory Task Force recommends the City Council take a position supporting maintaining the existing (Federal Communications Act) Title II rules and opposing the proposed Federal Communication Commission (FCC) action because of the following potential detrimental impacts to Davis:

• Loss of the FCC ability to regulate price, enabling increased broadband service costs;
• Loss of the democratic principle of free and open internet service;
• Loss of open, equal access for all internet service providers that could adversely impact communities of color and other grass root community organizing efforts; and limit opportunities for business startups;
• Exacerbate already limited broadband service competition.

Motion passed unanimously 9-0, 1 absent.

5. Adjourn – Adjourned by consensus at 7:12 p.m.